REMARKS

Claims 1-14 and 16-23 remain pending.

Claims 1-14 and 16-23 over Croft in view of Gendel

In the Office Action, claims 1-14 and 16-23 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Pat. No. 6,490,439 to Croft et al. ("Croft") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,127,936 to Gendel et al. ("Gendel"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1-6 recite a **variable** user link acceptable quality indicator to indicate an **amount** of quality achieved **beyond** that of an **acceptable level**, wherein the piconet connection acceptable quality determiner activates the **variable** user link acceptable quality indicator based on a quality of the condition **above** the **acceptable** level. Claims 7-14 and 16-23 recite providing an indication of an **amount** of quality achieved **above** compliance to an **acceptable** level, determined by an **amount** the **digital** link quality **exceeds** the minimum **digital** link quality threshold.

Croft discloses a lighted antenna that can be used to show that the transceiver is transmitting or receiving signals, that a data connection has been made, or that a Bluetooth piconet has been detected. (See Croft, Abstract) The Examiner specifically cites col. 8, line 57 to col. 9, line 2; and col. 9, line 61 to col. 10, line 3. In these teachings, Croft discloses that the "antenna can be used to provide a visual indication that conveys information to a user about . . . the strength of the incoming signals, or whether receiver 908 is transmitting or receiving."

Although Croft conveys to a user a visual indication about the strength of an incoming signal, Croft fails to disclose any type of limitations as a basis for the visual indication. Without limitations, a user is shown the entire spectrum of signal strength from the lowest to the highest, i.e., **NOT** based on any type of threshold. Croft fails to disclose or suggest a system and method respectively activating an indicator and providing a first indication based on an acceptable level determined by comparing a determined link quality and a minimum link quality threshold, as recited by claims 1-14 and 16-23.

The Examiner agrees that Croft fails to teach "that the link quality is at acceptable level determined by comparing the link quality and a minimum link quality threshold." (Office Action at 2) To cure this significant and important deficiency, the Examiner alleges that Gendel teaches "an apparatus for providing an indication of the magnitude of a quality wherein the acceptable link quality, determined by comparing the link quality and a minimum link quality threshold, is visually indicated to user". (Id)

Gendel teaches nothing more than a method for indicating an absolute magnitude of an RSSI in an RF receiver. According to Gendel, an LED is flashed, or a buzzer is beeped, a number of times indicating the absolute magnitude of the amount of the quantity being measured, e.g., RSSI.

This is precisely the conventional technique that the present invention appreciated and overcame. In particular, most users of digital devices are not technically savvy to understand how MUCH RSSI is sufficient for a particular application.

The present invention "provides consumers with **simple vision** into optimization of the location of wireless piconet devices". (SPECIFICATION, page 11, lines 5-6). The present invention not only indicates when a digital connection is achieved by meeting a minimal requirement, it further provides useful indication for OPTIMIZING a digital connection even AFTER the connection is fully achieved. For instance, perhaps a higher quality connection is possible even AFTER the digital link has been established.

Conventional techniques either indicate only the successful establishment of a digital link (giving no further indication useful to optimize the digital link), and/or indicate a technical measurement to the user (e.g., and amount of RSSI) that most users are not able to fully appreciate or understand.

In Croft's system a user is still left to wonder if the indicated signal strength is adequate for its intended purpose. In simple applications, even a low signal strength and low bandwidth may be adequate. However, in more demanding applications, a strong signal strength and high bandwidth are required. Croft's simplistic approach of simply giving a user a visual indication about the strength of an incoming signal does not give the user an indication if

the signal strength meets the requirements of a particular application. By selecting an appropriately valued minimum link quality threshold Applicants' basis of indication on a minimum link quality threshold allows a more informative indication if a signal strength meets a particular application.

Croft, even in combination with Gendel, still fails to disclose, teach or suggest a **variable** user link acceptable quality indicator to indicate an **amount** of quality achieved **beyond** that of an **acceptable level** as claimed by claims 1-6, or an indication of an **amount** of quality achieved **above** compliance to an **acceptable** level as claimed by claims 7-14 and 16-23.

For at least all the above reasons, claims 1-14 and 16-23 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

William H. Bollman
Reg. No. 36,457

MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC
2000 M Street, NW 7th Floor
Washington, DC 20036-3307
TEL. (202) 261-1020
FAX. (202) 887-0336